

WIRE  
PAPERPOINTS FOR DISCUSSIONA. TRAINING

1. What have we learned from previous winners who have done well? What sort of approach did they employ that may have been relevant for success?
2. Perhaps we should make a clear definition of "needs" (i.e., what type of applications should we pursue, and in what priority?). Our requirements may in fact specify what type of training (or training modification) are appropriate. Conversely, we should critically examine currently available training procedures and evaluate them relative to what they can be expected to do, what type of applications can they solve? What are their application limits? (See attached chart on "RV applications" for reference to possible RV problem-sets).  
Perhaps a matrix like the following could be developed:

PROBLEM SET	TRAINING METHOD			
	A	B	C	...
A <sub>1</sub>	+	0	-	?
B <sub>1</sub>	-	-	-	?

3. What are all relevant issues that need to be considered for viewer selection?

- Viewer Background (associated to problem set?)
- Psychological profile (type of RV skill, stability, etc)
- Personal preferences (associated to problem set?)
- other (i.e., targeting, reference, physical state of health, ...)

30. Is the TRAINING PROGRAM for so, a single product, that is important? (What is it used for training for?)

4. Define anticipated training pace, and other particular (i.e., session time, estimated number of sessions per stage, related activities such as drawing, sketching). How do we know when training is "complete"? How are training sessions evaluated? Does the current training approach limit application to a 'CRV' Targeting speed?

5. There is a pressing need to define "operational readiness" criteria. (both individual and unit). This must relate to priority of problem-sets, problem-set viewers 'qualify' for, degree of reliability/accuracy.... and various other issues (training procedure, person background, ...). This needs to be related to targeting methods, as possibly other factors.

6. Related to item 5, is a pressing need to define how the transition from "Training (whatever method)" to "operations" can occur? Is this instantaneous? How do training programs now available harden into the operational world? or do they not do this at all? If so, how are we going to fill that gap, or "operationally qualify" viewers? We need a "program, procedure, set of criteria, problem sets etc specifically for this."

Approved For Release 2000/08/10 : CIA-RDP96-00789R003800020006-3  
 then, both "finishing training" and "operation" need to be located together somehow

## 7. Some possible operational qualifiers:

(1) "Add-in" to training <sup>phase</sup>, various type of operational, or "simulated operational" problems, possibly increasing such task as training progresses. (or possibly, wait until after "formal" training ends).

## (2) Suggested operational qualifying "pockets":

- a. OPS - A . the real McCoy ... Targets of opportunity... can be anything... May be QRT or long term. Basic data of interest is unknown, though <sup>other</sup> aspects may be known.
- b. OPS - B . Simulated problems. For pre-ops calibration. Examples include various foreign problem sets (possibly from maps, latest photos, other...). The data is basically known (but not known by interviewee), or can be readily found.

- c. OPS - C . Simulated <sup>other</sup> problems. a variety of "other" problems can be examined if these problem sets relate to <sup>external</sup> intelligence applications. Examples include:

C-1 : State of health (of <sup>foreign</sup> individuals)

C-2 : Police work (limited trials regarding high interest police case work where resolution may be near at hand. There would be "concocting"; is not made part of anything other than in-house records for evaluation purposes. (i.e. not worked with police).

C-3: Proccognitive: can be anything. Examples  
 includ "predicting the next terrorist strike"; the  
 next <sup>major</sup> airplane accident, next major natural disaster  
 (where & where)... <sup>such</sup> "practice" may improve  
 reliability on certain "CPS-A" problems.

C-4 ~~can be~~ Social/track a variety of location  
 problems can be worked... in local area... or  
 with known travelers.

(3) above problem sets would learn have a variety of  
 targeting methods (not only those employed in training)

(4) <sup>complete</sup> ~~careful~~ records, evaluation procedure<sup>etc</sup>, are required for  
 these problems/tasks.

(5) all data from about above "problems" must be  
 kept from the interviewee... the interviewee only  
 knows the question(s)... Others (specific individual)  
 provide feedback & evaluation when known (or partially  
 known).

8. Interviewer: we need a bad- of interviewer now, what  
 if fed in such, a TOG?

9. TRAINING SESSION EVALUATION: Need a 2nd (or 2nd & 3rd) parts  
 evaluator: Interviewer recommended -- one & other provide  
 final evaluations. for all training sessions. C. 1 of ASAP!

BASIC DATA CATEGORIES

PT'S THAT APPLY (of 36 MAIN CATEGORIES) (36)

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. PRESENCE / ABSENCE   | 8  |
| 2. LOCATION / DEPLOYMENT  | 20 |
| 3. UNIT / FORCE STRUCTURE, COMPOSITION                                  | 4  |
| 4. TEST / PROGRAM / FACILITY STATUS ( <del>CURRENT, PROGRESSIVE</del> ) | 12 |
| 5. FUNCTION NATURE  | 12 |
| 6. CONFIGURATION / SIZE / CONTENTS                                      | 10 |
| 7. TECHNOLOGY / SYSTEM CAPABILITIES                                     | 15 |

CURRENT, NEW / PROTECTED / TIMING

ANALOGIES, LIMITATIONS / DEFECTS, FAILURES

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| 8. PEOPLE | 4 |
|-----------|---|

• DESCRIPTIONS / IDENTITY / ASSOCIATIONS

• MEDICAL ASPECTS (STATE OF HEALTH, DISEASE)

10 { Prediction intel

10. { PREDICTIVE (ALL OF ABOVE)



ALL

• TIP-OFF / CURING, CHANGES, NEW ACTIVITY

• PLANS / INTENTIONS

11. FOREIGN SECURITY DATA (CORES...)

(?)

(12) NARROWING DOWN POSSIBILITIES

ALL